

Amendments to the Drawings:

Formal drawings are being submitted herewith for approval of the Examiner. These drawings are to replace the drawings originally filed for the above-referenced application.

Attachment: Replacement Figures 1-4

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 17, 2007 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-36 and 42-44 are in the application. Claims 1-36 and 42-44 stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-30, 32-36, 42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sasaki (US Patent 5,959,672). Claim 1 includes “creating metadata that specifies *a predetermined region of the frame* and specifies at least *one predetermined colorimetric* transformation for application to the predetermined region of the frame.” In other words, claim 1 specifies a region of interest and then specifies a predetermined colorimetric transformation for that particular region. In contrast, Sasaki is for *correcting for an error* in a decoder that may be caused by the encoding process. Since this is error correction, it is by definition impossible to know in advance where the error is and what the error will be. In the error correction of Sasaki, the location of the error must be *found* in some manner. *Finding and specifying are antonyms not synonyms*. In Sasaki, the mode information is used to determine the objects which are of interest which must then be located using some algorithm or template. This is a three-step finding location process. (See column 53, line 60 - column 56, line 34) Note that the heading of this section is “[B-5] Strategy Control for Error Correction Based on Mode Information.”

In contrast, in claim 1, the metadata simply specifies a predetermined region as there isn’t any process, more specifically a three-step process as in Sasaki. Claim 1 is far more efficient than the three-step process of Sasaki. The metadata of claim 1 *directly* specifies the region of interest. The metadata of Sasaki does not directly identify the region but, at best, indirectly, locates through a three-step process the region of interest.

All the other independent claims are patentable for the reasons as in claim 1.

Claims 1, 6, 10, 14 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rai et al. (US Patent 6,337,692). Likewise, claim 1, as stated above, includes “creating metadata that specifies *a predetermined region of the frame* and specifies at least *one predetermined colorimetric* transformation for application to the predetermined region of the frame.” In contrast, Rai simply corrects color in the hue domain which was not corrected in the color domain.

(See column 4, line 60 and column 5, lines 10-20 of Rai) Rai simply does *not* disclose any metadata that specifies a region of interest and a corresponding colorimetric transformation for that region. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

All the other independent claims are patentable for the reasons as in claim 1.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins/lam
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-8282
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.